

SOCIAL ACTION

15¢

SEPTEMBER 15, 1949



What is a Christian College?

By Clyde A. Holbrook

SOCIAL ACTION

VOL. XV, NUMBER 7

SEPTEMBER 15, 1949

KENNETH UNDERWOOD
Editor

JENNIE EVANS
Managing Editor

SOCIAL ACTION, published monthly, except July and August, by the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches and by the Commission on Christian Social Action of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y. Victor Obenhaus and Elmer J. F. Arndt, Chairmen, Ray Gibbons and Huber F. Klemme, Directors, respectively.

Subscription \$1.50 per year; Canada \$1.60 per year. One to 9 copies, 15c. each; 10 to 49 copies, 12c. each; 50 or more copies, 10c. each.

*Copyright, 1949, by the
Council for Social Action*

COVER PHOTOGRAPHS:

Denison University and Bahnsen from Monkmyer.

CONTENTS

What is a Christian College? 3
Clyde A. Holbrook

Comment on: What is a
Christian College?

Daniel Jenkins 35
Bryant Drake 37

On To Action *back cover*
Ray Gibbons

The "Washington Report" department of *Social Action* which Thomas B. Keehn, legislative secretary of the Council for Social Action, has conducted for the past year will not be carried this year as a regular feature of the magazine. *Social Action* editors will call upon Mr. Keehn for frequent analyses of the national political scene as it relates to specific problems discussed in the magazine. Mr. Keehn now edits for the Council a *Legislative Action Service* which may be obtained by writing for it to 1751 N Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

Re-entered as second-class matter January 30, 1939, at the Post Office at New York, under the Act of March 3, 1879, by the Council for Social Action.

What is a Christian College?

By
Clyde A. Holbrook

It is chapel day in a college which claims to be Christian. Newspapers are rattling, almost drowning the busy click of knitting needles. Sociability is at an all-time high, as friends exchange gossip. This congenial buzzing will be partially dispelled when the choir sings. Some students, of a more serious turn of mind, are studying. Several faculty members sit in the front pews. They are supported by one member of the administration and several house mothers. The president of the college is not present; chapel does not rate high on his list of priorities.

The introit is heard—by the more alert; the dean of the chapel offers prayer, followed by a hymn sung principally by the choir and the dean. Some of the students remain seated, lest they interrupt a card game under way. The devotional reading is climaxed by the anthem. The speaker of the day is introduced. If he begins entertainingly enough, he may run the course set before him, to a more or less satisfactory finish twenty minutes later. The closing hymn, the benediction and choral response release some eleven hundred students. The dean retires to his office to still the nervous waves which have been rippling through his viscera since he awoke that morning with the realization that "Today is chapel." Compulsory chapel for the week is over.

The Religious Emphasis Week

Perhaps what is needed is something more "dynamic" and

"catchy"—a Religious Emphasis Week. The Religious Emphasis Week is prepared for by the student Christian groups on the campus, headed possibly by a coordinator of religious activities. There are to be flashy advertisements, announcing the "big name" speakers who will visit the campus. Mass meetings, "bull sessions," private student interviews, class meetings where visiting celebrities will speak, smokers, faculty luncheons, and a host of similar events are to be scheduled. The pledges of the fraternities are to be herded into sessions where, presumably, economic, international, racial, sexual, political, and scientific problems are to be treated in a religious context. In the jargon of the Religious Emphasis Week team, this is known as "getting down to grass-root levels and basic issues."

Then the schedules of personal interviews with the leaders

The Author



Guy Burgess
Colorado Springs

For the past three years, Clyde A. Holbrook has been Dean of Shove Memorial Chapel and Associate Professor of Religion at Colorado College. This fall he became Chairman of the Religion Department of Denison University. He has served as pastor of two churches: the Norfield Congregational Church, Weston, Connecticut (1937-1942), and the Westville Congregational Church, New Haven, Connecticut (1942-1945). He received his A.B. degree from Bates College, a B.D. from Colgate-Rochester Divinity School and his Ph.D. from Yale University. His interests in social action have led him to active work in the Religion and Labor Foundation, the Council of Christians and Jews, the Unity Council of Race Relations of Colorado Springs. The relation of Christianity to higher education has been the subject of several of his recent talks and magazine articles.

are to be kept filled, though it is difficult to persuade a college student to lay bare his soul to a complete stranger, on schedule. If the visiting team of religious leaders is composed of Protestants, Roman Catholics, and Jews, there will be some thick going on brotherly love, with here and there a jab at Protestants for persecuting Catholics, and at Christians for persecuting Jews. But nothing serious comes of it, as good fellowship is to pervade.

The faculty lunch goes well until one of the speakers suggests that a Christian college might be in the forefront of action in the minorities problem, by waiving "racial" criteria for admissions, and that Christian responsibility might extend to bringing faculty salaries in line with those of the plumbers working on the campus. After these unfortunate breaks, the president hurriedly adjourns the group to the recreational program. By the end of the week, the campus committee has culled over the speakers, deciding which had "punch" enough to be asked to return, and the feeling has been expressed among them that the whole week has "functioned effectively at all levels." Members of the committee themselves have been too busy to do more than look in on several meetings—but things have been moving along.

Without undue exaggeration, we have here two methods of keeping colleges and universities on the list of Christian colleges. To put it charitably, they have been far from successful in presenting to the liberal arts college as a whole the relevance and truth of the Christian perspective on life. This is not to say that chapel services or religious emphasis periods are totally without merit. Students have received lasting impressions, favorable to the Christian faith, through both agencies. Rather, such methods are too limited in scope and effectiveness to change in any real sense the essential attitudes of colleges and universities themselves. A more radical approach is needed.

Causes of Discontent in Higher Education

It is common to castigate higher education for its ineptitude—for "ivory tower" speculations, so-called Communistic leanings, failure to be in touch with "economic and social realities," country-club atmosphere, callousness toward morals, purposelessness, fragmentary disunified curricula, pedantry, poor instruction, wastefulness of time and money. As Dr. Dorothy Emmett said, "The liberal university is a collection of people lacking common convictions, pursuing unrelated specialisms, and using their supposed 'neutrality' as a pretext for evading discussion of fundamental and controversial questions."

Belief in Omnicompetence

Analysis of this discontent shows several causes for it. First, our colleges and universities have come to believe themselves omnicompetent. They have been pressured to accept the position of being all things to all men. They aim to produce "character," "responsible citizens," "specialists and research men," "personalities," "aesthetes," "athletes," "technicians," "leaders," "followers," "Christian personalities," "people that think for themselves," "people inculcated with democratic humanistic values," "bank presidents," "scholars," etc. The simple fact that college and university integrity is lost in this assortment of often mutually exclusive ends is overlooked. To make the omnicompetent college more pathetic, it is now turned into a "whipping boy" by the same forces in our society which want to pile more responsibilities upon it. Because it listens to every pressure group which chances along, it loses sight of its unique mission, and allows the unifying purposes, which man needs, to be submerged.

Dishonesty in Claims and Practices

The fellow vice of omnicompetence is a dishonesty in the claims and practices of colleges, which ranges from adminis-

trative policies to the teaching in our classrooms. As President Kenneth I. Brown of Denison pointed out in an address before the Association of American Colleges, academic integrity is often a scarce product in respect to promises made to prospective students in college catalogues, fund raising, contractual agreements between faculties and colleges, as well as the lip service paid to non-discrimination against minority groups and to "truth-seeking."

This dishonesty becomes most dangerous in the claim that our colleges are interested solely in truth arrived at by the use of unprejudiced reason. What this phrase conceals is that man thinks with his will and with presuppositions, not with some mythical entity termed "reason alone"; that values are part of truth; that the Judaeo-Christian tradition with its values has a crucial contribution to make to the understanding of human experience;* that every institution and man confronts morally ambiguous power situations. Nor are we to accept docilely the claim that impartial reason is neutral in respect to religious values. It has rather created a climate of opinion of optimistic, man-centered rationalism, which refuses to relate life to ultimate perspectives, and leads students to believe seriously that man is a decent chap whose institutions, with a little "scientific" tinkering, will carry him onward and upward. This outlook ruins any depth view of human history, and leaves the student with a false certitude about facts, which themselves are partial and misleading in their implications. The method by which the "facts" are arrived at and the world view which is presupposed by the method are the last things to be brought under scrutiny.

Whether this basic dishonesty is more the fault of ignorance or perversity of mind and heart, it is difficult to judge, but the practice continues.

*See the conclusions of the Hazen Report on "College Reading and Religion," showing lack of textbooks with adequate understanding of religion.

"Cafeteria Style" Education

The third factor shown by an analysis of higher education is pluralism of curricula, which has for the past four decades been increasing, and only now shows signs of being checked. In the early twentieth century, a decided upswing in the number of students and institutions at college levels occurred, bringing with it an increase in the number of departments and course offerings. With this external pressure, there went a much publicized increase of interest in the student as an individual. The educational mood sometimes swung to the extreme of adjudging each student, by virtue of his acceptance into a college, as capable of selecting the best program of study fitted to his "personality" and "interests." "Needs" were another matter! Thus was born a plurality of course offerings aptly called "cafeteria style" education. Out of the delectable academic fare provided, the student was to choose what was hoped would be a tasty and well-rounded diet.

The effects of this tendency are still felt. Professors moved increasingly toward over-specialization, with consequent shrinkage of competence in related areas. The sense of departmental prerogatives and authority increased as learned men separated themselves from their colleagues. "The increasing departmentalization of universities during the past hundred years," Dr. Alfred N. Whitehead remarked, ". . . has tended to trivialize the mentality of the teaching profession."* Inescapably, student mentality followed suit. Lack of balance in offerings left the humanities, especially philosophy and religion, begging—and with them went contact with the deeper issues of life.

Secularism Captured Higher Education

Because of these developments, secularization captured higher education. By secularism is meant two things: first, the view of life which is unaware of the pertinence of an inde-

*See H. P. Van Dusen, "Education and Christian Faith" in *Christian Education*, vol. XXXI no. 2, pp. 84 ff.

pendent, objective spiritual and moral order or will, by virtue of which man lives, by which he is judged, and on which he ultimately depends for good, and to which he owes his last loyalty; secondly, that view of life which omits the witness to that universal will recognized as normative in Christ. The visible expressions of secularism in the colleges are seen in the selection of administrative heads who have little sense for religious values as they relate to the life of their institutions; emphasis upon comfortable materialistic "success" as understood in American suburban life; the withdrawing of colleges from religious affiliations; a deemphasis of religion and philosophy in the curriculum;* a depersonalizing of relations between administration heads and faculties, between faculties and students; stress upon "adjustment" to society; the idolatrous presumption that the sole ultimate loyalty of man is to democracy—usually so interpreted as to exclude its basis in Judaeo-Christian tradition and its more radical implications for social, political, and economic facets of life; the assumption that religion is inconceivable as a unifying center for the disjointed offerings of our colleges and universities, as witness the Harvard Report's conclusion, "Religion is not now for most colleges, a practicable source of intellectual unity";† and in many quarters a breakdown of any committedness to a unifying principle by faculty, administration, and students.

Basic Christian Affirmations

The Christian conscience cannot accept without misgiving and guilt the scene in higher education, and its answer must be forged out of its own basic affirmations, neither falling into the dogmatism of Roman Catholicism nor the incipient anarchy of historical Protestantism.

*A. C. Outler, "Colleges, Faculties, and Religion," *Hazen Pamphlet*.

†"General Education in a Free Society," Harvard Press, p. 39.

God's Sovereignty Over Life

Christian faith affirms God's righteous sovereignty over life, sovereignty which is not to be relinquished to any temporal, finite entity such as human reason, the church or the state. His will for man has been decisively, but continually revealed to man through Christ, faith in whom establishes the Christian community or church. Understood by the experience of men with the Bible and nature, God is known as Creator, "source of Being and Value," the Judge and Redeemer, the Destiny of man and history. Man stands before God as a responsible being, his worth conferred upon him by God. Man is free to fix his life upon finite ends, himself, his society or class, his aesthetic accomplishments, or his animalistic tendencies, thereby establishing himself as a sinner. God's sovereign love is not powerless to transform man, but can bring him into community with Himself and other men. This is the community wherein man feels himself truly known and freed to self-giving, love and service.

The location of this redemptive work is history, where God creatively works for mutuality and community. Human institutions may bulk in man's awareness, but he cannot hide behind them, from the searching love of God. Man is not saved through his institutions, but his institutions and he are subject to God's judgment and redemption.

The Nature of Man and His Search For Truth

Among the capacities implanted in man by his Creator is understanding. Christian faith recognizes that this will to understanding cannot stop short, satisfied with materialistic and humanistic ends. Intelligence, imagination, aesthetic creativity, and moral will achieve their fullest competence when the whole self reaches out in their use for the Source of Value and Being. The truth above all others which enfranchises the understanding is the truth about man before God. This, the reason does not discover unaided, but by the set of the whole

self in consecration to God, for the reason also is as capable of self-corruption as is the heart of man.

Thus Christian faith sees itself not as the opponent of truth-seeking, but as bringing man up against the final truth, in terms of which all lesser truths take on the quality of truth. Truth is not merely contemplative and rational; it is found in the practice of community by which men, under God, address themselves with insight and courage, to ridding themselves and their societies of those attitudes and practices which deny human dignity, frustrate man's free access to his fellow men and God, disintegrate and dehumanize personality. To this service the Christian feels himself called, not with the self-satisfaction of the "saint," but in humility that he too lives under the grace of God and by the numerous contributions of other men.

Four Levels for Affirming Christian Insights

The Christian college here described affirms these insights of Christian faith, and implements them in its life. It interprets its purposes in terms of them, and holds itself responsible for their execution. In the light of them, its educational procedures will move upon four closely related levels.

Transmit Knowledge of Christianity

The first of these is transmission of facts about and values of the Christian religion, which means that the knowledge of Christianity will be incorporated into the learning process. This is not to insist that every province of study must aim to "prove" Christianity, but it does imply that religion will be fairly presented whenever relevant. Transmission lays the basis upon which students may do coherent thinking about religion, and it therefore calls for Christian instructors with scrupulous preparation in their respective fields. Young people are as

often lost to the Christian faith from ignorance about religion as from willfulness.

Interpret Relations Between Religion, Culture and Individual

The second level closely follows the first: namely, the evaluation and interpretation of the relations between religion and culture, religion and the individual. At this point, the discriminating and disciplined intelligence is developed in challenging the facile generalizations to which both students and instructors are prone, when discussing religion. "Religion grew out of fear; it is merely a defense mechanism"; "science eliminates religion"; "Christianity causes wars, and therefore should be abandoned"; "all great movements for human betterment came from non-religious persons." So run the crasser clichés which by presentation of data and the development of critical intelligence must be met and overcome. This is also the level of interpretation, as it is shown how religious insights have shaped life in the past, and are capable of shaping it today.

Participate in Values of Christian Faith

The third level brings us to appreciation and participation in values of Christian faith as these are experienced in conduct, art, music, literature, worship in the college community. Here the daring of Christian commitment may be seen as a possible possession of the individual. This participation in Christian values is secured by the fact that the student lives in a community where people are valued, where inner disciplines are observed, where religion is openly assumed as vital, where the general Christian purpose of the college is felt.

Express Christian Values

The fourth level is that which allows for expression of Christian values. Expression of Christian faith involves treating such on-campus problems as cheating, drinking, student government, service to foreign students. As off-campus activi-



One of the levels upon which educational procedures of a Christian college should move is that which allows for expression of Christian values in such activities as part-time service in social agencies, summer work projects, political and social action, investigations of social conditions. Above: a Schauffler College student serves the local church by conducting a Sunday School class.

ties, there are part-time service in social agencies, summer work projects, political and social action, supervised investigations of social conditions, participation in church life, etc. Expression prevents the frustration which descends upon the student who is told what ought to be done—only to find that the college is embarrassed if he takes seriously its instruction. This is not to say that any student's harebrained scheme for "uplift" is to be blessed by the faculty and administration. Strategies of procedure must also be studied with care.

Especially important is the need for pointing out that a student's social responsibility is not of the same duration in a specific situation as that of the college or those with whom he works in the community. In a few years he graduates; his real fortunes lie elsewhere—yet he may expose the college and his

friends who remain to severe reprisals. On the other hand, the Christian college which takes seriously the ideal of Christian community should, when responsible Christian action is involved, act as the supporter and participant in such action.*

Christian Impact on Trustees and Faculty

If transmission, interpretation, participation, and expression are the four central tasks of the Christian college, then what impact does the Christian faith sketched above have upon them in relation to the trustees, administration, faculty, curriculum, students, and extra-curricular life?

Role of the Trustees

We assume that the Christian college we discuss falls into the group of private, rather than state or municipal institutions.† Trustees for this type of institution are often selected for a variety of reasons, few of which have much to do with religion. They are usually the source of power and court of final appeal. Their decisions reach beyond any immediate contract the rest of the institution has with them, but the entire college feels their authority. Ordinarily, however, their main concern is not the college, but their professions, and too often their principal concern with the college narrows to budgetary interests. But the greatest difficulties lie in their possible divorce from the life of the institution itself, their satis-

*See M. Cuninggim, *The College Seeks Religion*, p. 267.

†The author is not implying that the public-supported institution is unable within the framework of its purposes and structure to carry out many of the proposals made here. However, the private or church-related college which avows a Christian purpose in its education should be freer to transmit an explicit religious tradition than the public college and certainly should feel more strongly an obligation to seek to carry out the implications of a Christian faith in its faculty, curriculum, etc. in order to make a distinctive contribution to higher education. For these reasons, when limitations of space made necessary concentration upon a particular type of educational institution, the private college was chosen for emphasis.

faction with routine accomplishments, and lack of convictions about Christian education.

What can a Christian college rightfully expect from its trustees? A genuine commitment to the Christian faith, an active concern that a Christian purpose pervade the institution, with the president chosen not only for his academic, fund raising, and administrative abilities, but for his devotion to Christian character. Strengthened by their sense of the value of the Christian college, the trustees will financially support their college, and seek support from others for it. They will stand against those pressures, largely financial, which destroy the academic freedom and the Christian integrity of the school. Mrs. X, with several thousands of dollars, demands that Professor A be dismissed, because she does not approve of his social theories. A native "fascist" undertakes a private investigation of textbooks and instructors, and plants his agents in college classrooms. These are pressures to be withstood.

The trustees who take their position seriously will avoid the impression of arbitrary possessiveness of the institution and will recognize a mutual interest and responsibility between themselves and the personnel of the college.* Nor should they plead ignorance of what goes on in the college. It is their duty to know, to the limits of their ability, and to share in and contribute to the community of the college. "Chain of command" methods should be discarded in favor of relationships which permit faculty and trustees to meet and openly discuss their problems. Unless the board of trustees shows itself convinced of the desirability of Christian methods in higher education, much of the work carried on at other levels will be negated.

The President Sets the Tone of the College

In turning to the administration, we are reminded by Dr. Kenneth S. Latourette that "The key to the situation is the

*See "Test and Tragedy at Olivet" in *The Christian Century*, Jan. 26, 1949.

president." More directly than any other member of the administration, the president sets the tone of an institution—if its constituent personnel is not too numerous. Easy as it is for him to be lost in administrative detail, he can never be so far gone as to lose touch with his faculty and students in their task of realizing community of interests and values. His appreciation of fellow members of the administration and faculty contributes immeasurably to the sharing of values. Nothing sooner breaks morale in a college community than the realization that the head of the institution is either indifferent to or holds in contempt his colleagues. Often disaffection of faculty members is traceable to this cause rather than salary problems.

In his position between the trustees and the college proper, the president must display personal integrity. The president who undercuts his faculty in the presence of the trustees, and does the same to the trustees before the faculty is not only committing professional suicide, but is seriously injuring the bonds of good faith and understanding which undergird a Christian institution. Compare the college president who had systematically misrepresented a faculty plan for higher salaries to the trustees as being the work of a small group of "malcontents," with the president who voluntarily worked out a plan with his faculty and presented it to the trustees. At all costs, the Christian college must be known for its humane and plain dealing with faculty and students alike. And to this end, the president is the principal agent.

Qualities Needed in Members of the Faculty

In large part, the Christian college will make direct impact upon its students by its faculty members. At this point, the Christian college confronts the problem of securing faculty members with qualities which are needed in a Christian institution. Where are found men and women with excellent academic preparation, understanding, and conviction in Christian faith, of balanced personality traits (including imagination

and wit), interest in students, sufficient breadth of preparation to enable them to discourse beyond the immediate confines of their specialties, and the ability to communicate knowledge and conviction to inquiring minds? Our graduate schools have dominated the preparation of college teachers, and with their specializations, lack of teacher training, and, more often than not, secularistic viewpoint, they have tended to turn out a product peculiarly unfit for the Christian college.

Yet the problem must be met. In some measure it is being met by the influence of theological schools upon the graduate schools with which they are affiliated, and by the quiet work of concerned college instructors who take it upon themselves to interest students in work in Christian colleges.

In the hiring of teachers, the Christian college will not return to the "religious test" or "creedal conformity" notion—not if it hopes to attract adventuresome minds to its faculty. Better that prospective instructors have a sound developing Christian philosophy of life than that they be separated out by denominational affiliation or specific doctrinal adherence. In fact, it would be desirable that even denominational schools represent an ecumenical view!

Administration-Faculty Relations

The implication of the Christian faith for administration-faculty relations should be obvious, but certain minimal responsibilities must be met. The administration of a Christian college should enter into frank and sincerely maintained understandings with its faculty on the following essential points: on salaries which are as just as possible in view of the college's total budget and salaries in comparable institutions, salary scale, promotion methods, tenure, pension plans, dismissal procedures, sabbaticals, housing, academic freedom, committee and extra-curricular responsibilities. Contracts, written or verbal, on these points should be faithfully adhered to by all parties.

The faculty members in their relations with the administra-

tion are bound in a loyalty and faithfulness not only to co-operate with the administration, but to maintain the Christian aims of the college as they have been mutually understood. Certainly no faculty member should accept appointment, nor be retained, if he is dissatisfied with the professed aims of the institution.

Student-Faculty Relations

The faculty member owes his students thorough preparation for classroom work, and high standards for himself and his students. The Christian college must not become an academically disreputable hangout for pious frauds among faculty or students. Nor can the Christian teacher deceive himself with the notion that he is indirectly communicating Christian virtue to his students when actually his slovenly intellectual habits and presentation are infecting his students. He is to achieve and pass on to his students a creative dissatisfaction for the shoddy and superficial; he cannot himself offer shoddy goods.

Faculty and Classroom Content

His Christian faith will be expressed not only by his life and character, but by explicit instruction. He should have reasons for the faith within him which he is ready to share, but not to force dogmatically upon his students. To accomplish this requires patience and tact, but not a supine fear of students' dislike. He attempts to effect a meeting of minds through mutual confidence. He shares his religious and moral evaluations as they pertain to his field. His scholarly objectivity does not conceal what he considers valuable. The Alumni Committee Report of Amherst puts the matter well when it states, "no teacher worthy of the name can avoid having convictions on vital issues." It is "one of the chief functions of a liberal education to teach young men the possibility of and the need for, reflective commitment."^{*}

The teacher also owes to both his students and his colleagues

*See Cuninggim, *op. cit.*, p. 262.

a breadth of knowledge which includes religion and rudimentary knowledge of other fields. Thus, no economics course can deal adequately with the "just price" theory without knowledge of Aquinas' formulation of that doctrine. No American history course plays fair with its data unless the religious motivations of the early colonists of the Atlantic seaboard and the missionaries of the Southwest are recognized; indeed without its religious roots, the concept of American democracy itself is quite unintelligible. No sociology course concerned with penal methods and mental hospitals can overlook the contribution of the Quakers. No understanding of the bases of modern science has been reached until with Whitehead, we understand that the scientific temper was derived from the schooling which the mentality of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had in medieval thought.* And how can one be said to understand literature without appreciating the religious faiths which have been both affirmed and denied in it?

When any field of human knowledge is cross-fertilized by the insights from others, there is not only enrichment in aesthetic enjoyment of the primary field; there occurs that linkage of ideas which brings wholeness, and hence understanding. This sense of balanced wholeness Christian colleges should feel bound to contribute to the confused educational scene today, and its professors should be encouraged to do the kind of study, thinking, and teaching which contributes to it.

The faculty member owes his students certain virtues, such as respect for their persons, the best counsel on life problems, the fellowship of his family and home, and an interest and support of students in their efforts to express Christian values.

Faculty Member's Responsibility to Himself

The faculty member has a responsibility to himself as a person and a scholar. One cannot be all outgoing, at the beck

*See A. N. Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World*, pp. 18 and 19.

and call of the immediate pressures of students, colleagues, and administration, without some "thinning" of the person himself. As von Hügel once wrote, "The intellectual virtues are no mere empty name: candor, moral courage, intellectual honesty, scrupulous accuracy, chivalrous fairness, endless docility to facts, disinterested collaboration, unconquerable hopefulness, perseverance, manly renunciation of popularity and easy honors, love of bracing labor, and strengthening solitude and many other cognate qualities bear upon them the impress of God and His Christ."* No faculty member can achieve a modicum of these values if he does not take time for personal commitment to them. In retirement comes poise, and the realization that knowledge is a trust from God, and as such it is one of the most precious "possessions" God has allowed him.

The Christian faculty member also owes responsibility to the broader Christian community, as it does to him. As a member of a college or university which aims at Christian faith, he is part of the church universal. From this relation he draws his inspiration and support, as he also does in realizing that he helps to prepare men and women for participation in the church.

Christian Impact on the Curriculum

When the Christian college looks to its curriculum, it asks, "How can one talk of a Christian curriculum?" There are no Christian languages or sciences, and there are no specifically Christian methods for teaching which can be incorporated into a printed schedule of courses. Doesn't everything here depend upon the instructors themselves, rather than the methods, content, and textbooks used?

Granted the importance of these considerations, nevertheless, the formal organization of a college's instruction does bear important relations to its function as a Christian institu-

*See A. J. Coleman, *The Task of the Christian in the University*, pp. 58-59.

tion. The organization and content of courses show explicitly the college's concern for religious values. At a glance one may see whether a particular college centers its attention upon the central types of experience or upon the tangentials. One may know whether thoughtful care has gone into the interrelations of class offerings, or whether the curriculum has splayed out to cover everything, without consideration of balance and depth.

Two Categories of Courses: 1) Religion Proper; 2) Integrative

In addition to the solid center of liberal arts and subjects, two broad categories of courses should be found in the curriculum of a Christian college. First, those which deal with religion in general and the Christian religion in particular. "No curriculum which ignores or suppresses a competent and critical examination of the history and literature of the Judaeo-Christian religious tradition can fairly be called either 'liberal' or 'general'."* Nothing short of this standard can be acceptable. The second type, of course, is that which aims to bring into a unified religious and ethical viewpoint extensive masses of human knowledge. These are variously designated as "core," "survey," "general education," "cultural heritage," "great issues" courses.

Religion courses proper mean that a college recognizes that religion is neither the sole concern of the churches, nor, as so often is the case, the refuge for personal idiosyncracies and private prejudice. They signify that religion and religions have a public history, that there are "facts" in this field as in other fields, that sincere scholarship and earnest intellectual effort are the enemies of religious obscurantism and the allies of a vital and defensible religious faith, that the claims of religion will have a fair examination in the arena of academic discourse.

*A. C. Outler, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

Three Types of Religion Proper Courses

Although there will be a variety of religion courses among Christian colleges, provision should be made for at least two, possibly three types of courses. The historical-descriptive type would aim primarily at presenting data, though the instructor's attitude will normally carry beyond mere factual presentation. Included in this category would be introductions to Hebrew religion, the Old and New Testaments, the life and teachings of Jesus, the history of Christianity, showing its geographical advances and regressions, its interactions with the forms of social existence and world religions.

The second type of religion course may be called the evaluative or speculative type, in which knowledge of basic data may be assumed, and where emphasis is laid upon the philosophical and theological approaches. The philosophy of religion is this kind of course, aiming at acquaintanceship with the principal forms in which philosophies have interpreted religious concepts, with ample opportunity afforded for a critical appraisal of them. Also in this kind of course is the study of Christian ethics in relation to contemporary social and personal problems, the relations of science and religion, the psychology of religion, wherein the nature of man is considered from the standpoints of the schools of psychology and Christian faith, and in which religious development in the person is treated.

A third type may be desirable, although it looks toward the professional religious school: that which deals with methods in religious education itself, including such courses as the programs, methods, and principles by which religious groups have propagated their faith.

Should Religion Courses Be Compulsory?

Should religion courses be made compulsory in a Christian college? Preferably not. If the other factors in the Christian college are having their effect, students should be drawn to

these courses naturally. What is needed is such a high grade religion department that a student will feel he has missed something if he has not taken courses in it. Sometimes the general education courses in social sciences or humanities prove excellent "eye-openers" to students who are interested in pursuing further the study of religion. A compromise solution to the problem of compulsion may be the general course on the nature and principal concepts of religion in the western world.* A religious literacy test, which examines the religious knowledge of the freshman student, would determine whether or not he should be required to take the course.

Courses Integrating Knowledge From a Religious Perspective

Secularism, we have observed, is abetted by the fragmentary nature of the curriculum. The movement against the disjointed offerings is already in full swing, as colleges reexamine their curricula and attempt to make provisions for general education. The Christian college moves in the same direction, not because others do so, but because it seeks to recognize the wholeness of human knowledge and experience under God. It cannot be content to leave its students with a view of life made up of rags and patches. It seeks understanding of God's purpose in history in its broadest sense, and therefore makes place for the relatedness of truths by synoptic views of experience.

Knowledge which is portrayed without recognition of its organic relatedness to all other knowledge is falsely presented . . . Religion, a true knowledge of God, far from being a peripheral or incidental subject in the scheme of education . . . is the Queen of the Sciences and controlling Reality through which all else derives its being, and the truth concerning Him, as best man can apprehend, must be the keystone of the ever-incomplete arch of human knowledge.†

Some Christian colleges may develop the core course and

*See Bell, *op. cit.*, pp. 171-173.

†H. P. Van Dusen, *op. cit.*, pp. 90-91.

core faculty, whereby certain faculty members are responsible for bringing together into a religio-ethical perspective the basic ideas of modern social sciences, or the religious and philosophic ideas of Western culture. Denison University is developing its work along these lines. At Hamline University, the general education program takes the form of a course entitled "The Philosophical and Religious Backgrounds of Contemporary Civilization." Its aim, as President Hurst Anderson explains, is to "inject into the main intellectual stream on the Hamline University campus the Christian tradition in all of its implications."* Occidental, after its general courses in social sciences and humanities, offers the History of Civilization, which aims to unify the material of the social sciences and the humanities, including religion. Bucknell has offered to selected students, for the past two years, a program which affords an opportunity to draw together the work of their previous courses and to work out a philosophy of life. Whatever the method employed, the Christian college owes its students a picture of human experience which is coherent without superficiality.

Christian Impact on Students

There is no Christian college where students themselves are not Christian. Yet this is a difficult characteristic to measure. The making of a student body of Christian young men and women begins in the publicity which the college puts out. Does it clearly state the aims of the institution? Are course requirements in religion, chapel, and extra-curricular religious activities given their due place? Can a student read the catalogue and discover what is expected of him in a religious way? The admissions office particularly has the responsibility of selecting students not only for scholarship, but for Christian character. But shall church membership be taken as evidence

*"Religion and the Curriculum" in *Association of American Colleges Bulletin*, vol. 35, no. 2, p. 269, May 1949.

of Christian character? Hardly. Personal consultations by admissions officers and/or by alumni are used, along with more strict attention to checking character references.

Should only "Christian" Students Be Admitted

The Christian college meets a peculiar embarrassment when it comes to admitting only Christian students. Is a Christian college to adopt a veritable quota system on "Christians" and rule out Jewish students? Can it consistently, with Christian purpose say with Dr. Latourette that it excludes those who are not "in active sympathy with its Christian purpose"?* Are agnostic youth less susceptible to Christian influences or less in need of them than Christian youth? As a matter of fact, it is often the agnostic youth who proves the most open to the study of religion and Christianity, without the interference of garbled versions of religion gained from our Protestant religious educational systems. The Christian college, on the other hand, does not have the responsibility of diluting its religious standards to accommodate everybody in the name of democracy. It must be sufficiently exclusive to retain its character on one hand, but also sufficiently inclusive to open its doors to those who at the present rate will never be touched by the churches. And this calls for a discriminating entrance policy whereby a balance is maintained between these two elements in the student body.

One-Race, One-Class Campus is Not Christian

The college which has taken pains to make its campus a one-race or one-class campus is obviously not Christian. There is some hesitancy on the part of college faculties and administrations to take quiet steps toward getting out of the one-race and class status, but the temper of college students is ready for forward steps in this direction. Surely it ill becomes a college labeling itself as Christian to lag behind secular

*K. S. Latourette, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

institutions. The member of a racial minority or lower economic class should be accepted on the same basis as any other student, not because of his status, but because he is recognized as a suitable candidate for the school, and because of the contribution he can make to the college.

College Can Assume Student Interest in Religion

One thing can be assumed of any student body—an interest in religion, which with right conditions may awaken as a desire for an orientation of life to God. The problems of life may not be formulated in religious or Christian terms by students—but paganism does not consist merely in ignorance of the religious vocabulary. The Allport, Gillespie and Young



The Christian college, according to the author, is not a one-race, one-class institution. College administrations will work toward keeping the campus interracial, inter-faith, intersectional and international. Above: The Cosmopolitan Club for internationally-minded students of all nationalities at Oberlin College.

study of "The Religion of the Post-War College Student" showed considerable religious inclination on the part of the students questioned.* The student body of the Christian college will reflect the secularistic atmosphere from which it comes. The most stringent admissions policy will not be able to isolate Christian youth of conviction and purpose from these. Yet here lies the great opportunity for the Christian college: to bring students of this type into a community committed to the search for knowledge under God. The Christian college should be thoroughly missionary minded, yet not one which lowers standards and ideals to conquer. To this end, a Christian college should not become a band of the "saved," but it should nevertheless play fair with students who come to it out of the Christian churches, and therefore not dump as many "happy pagans" as possible on the campus, simply, as one college treasurer remarked, because there is no difference in the amount of tuition they pay.

Extra-Curricular Life of the Student

The extra-curricular life of the student is highly important, but it should not be allowed to become the sole aim of college. There is responsibility for keeping balance in its life at this point. From such basic factors as adequate, supervised housing and health conditions, through the consideration of social life, including athletics, student morale, and specific agencies for Christian influence, there should run a sense of planned, shared responsibility.

Often, when social life begins, Christian values cease, but so far as possible, the weight of responsibility in this area should fall upon representative student government. Dances, parties, hikes, ski trips, etc. are part of college life, and should rely for their support upon free student initiative, with the college authorities in close, but not officious touch with them.

*See *Journal of Psychology*, 1945, p. 25, Hazen Foundation reprint.

Pride in the reputation of the school will help to maintain a sense of honor, which can meet the common problems of co-educational relations, cheating, drinking, and the like. Athletic programs have become largely administration-alumni matters, rather than directly undergraduate concerns. The securing of athletes by hidden subsidies, treatment of athletes, and the hocus-pocus associated with guarantees for games offer pitfalls for the Christian college, as seen in the case of one large denominational university in the mid-west, which pays its football team room, board, and a sizable monthly scholarship for its services. The "Purity Code," governing much of inter-collegiate athletics, has had a beneficial effect, but the excessive emphasis placed upon athletics in many colleges often leads to questionable moral practices. There is a place for inter-collegiate athletics, but not to the detriment of what the college stands for.

Extra-Curricular Activities in Religion

The Christian college makes a place for and emphasizes its specific extra-curricular offering in the religious field. Counseling by selected faculty members and deans of chapels, student Christian Associations, independent religious groups, opportunities for church and social service, will be encouraged. Yet the extra-curricular program should not be overloaded with "do good" agencies. Better a few in proportion to the size of the student body and the resources of the college and/or denomination, than several competing, incompetently run groups. It would be expected that they would be centers of free discussion, where principles of private religious living, social effectiveness, worship, and fellowship are paramount.

College Chapel

We return to the point of departure—college chapel. No rule can be laid down as to whether compulsory or voluntary chapel is better. Nor can any number of chapel services be arbitrarily decided upon as fulfilling Christian demand.



Whether or not chapel attendance is compulsory, the Christian college will provide opportunity for religious worship. Christian devotion, inspiration and worship will appear as an integral part of the college program. Shown here is one of the chapel services at Schauffler College, where faculty, students and outside guests join in leading worship.

Whether or not compulsion is used for chapel attendance, opportunity should be afforded for voluntary religious worship. The college is not the church, but the more effective its witness to Christian values in education, the more naturally Christian devotion, inspiration, and worship will appear at its center. This is the thought expressed by William Clark in "Preface to College Chapel," when he states that "The true college does not have a religious program; it is a religious program."* Preparation for it by student participants, faculty, or administrators should be painstaking, so that the experience is its own vindication for existence.

*Association of American Colleges Bulletin, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 271 ff.

Financing of the Christian College

A note of unreality creeps into any description of a Christian college which does not raise the question of its financing. At a time when colleges large and small are begging for funds, when the income on invested funds is low, when students are crowding municipal and state universities, when taxes eat into private incomes, and prices are still high—where does the private Christian college come in?*

The problem of financing the Christian college is largely the same as that of financing any private liberal arts college; that is, there are fewer large-scale gifts being given for education, and new sources of income must be found. There are two camps of thinkers on the question. The first wishes to reverse the trend, already under way, of direct grants to colleges from federal and, to a lesser degree, from state and municipal governments. The second camp encourages this trend. That the Protestant churches have a high stake in the outcome of this controversy is clear.

Arguments Against Federal Aid to Higher Education

The arguments against federal aid to education, including the Christian colleges, have become familiar. Federal aid to education means government censorship of academic freedoms, introduction of chauvinistic propaganda, "witch hunts," "Communist" scares, the bungling of Washington strategists, reduction of competition among colleges, from which helpful experiments in education have emerged, the virtual putting out of business of the unique services of church-related colleges, additional expenses and taxes, the introduction of the military on the campus as in civil government, a weakening of the critical temper of faculties under government patronage, in fact, the loss of another free institution from American life.

*See Seymour E. Harris, *How Shall We Pay for Education?* for an analysis of the economics of education.

"A review of the history of federal grants for educational purposes warrants the generalization that, as the amount of federal funds has increased, the federal controls over the programs that are supported by these funds have also increased," report Russell and Judd in their study of *The American Educational System*.*

Arguments For Federal Aid to Higher Education

To these arguments, those who see the need and desirability of federal aid to higher education reply that the government now directly and indirectly is assisting colleges and universities (church, private, state types) by tax exemptions, giving or selling surplus properties at saving figures, remuneration for instructional programs and research projects, ROTC units, and GI Bill—yet no undesirable controls have been established; guarantees of non-interference have been written into laws governing the use of federal funds for education; dependence upon other sources of income bring pressures no less real than those feared from government, and conceivably more, not less independence will be secured from local and regional pressures which have proved detrimental.

Proponents of federal aid assert further that all institutions of higher education need aid to democratize education, making it more widely available, and that government aid and standards will make for better teachers, and prevent loss of talent both in students and faculties. Federal scholarships given on the basis of competitive examinations to individual students would permit them to attend any recognized college or university. Grants could be made to all types of educational institutions, proponents suggest, according to their capacities to provide education economically and effectively. Recognized educators could supervise the government program.

Those who urge federal aid to higher education reason that

*See *Association of American Colleges Bulletin*, vol. 35, no. 2 and vol. 39, no. 2; also Bell, *op. cit.*, for arguments against federal aid to higher education.

the public is not supporting its educational institutions at present adequately for the needs of a democratic society; hence federal funds are needed. Few alternative plans for funds from other sources are forthcoming from opponents of federal aid, and these do not recognize that the federal system responds better to changing economic conditions and is more productive of revenue than state, municipal, and private financial structures. Proponents maintain that we can pay for education when we note the increase in private expenditures in retail stores from 42 to 97 billion dollars from 1939 to 1946, as compared with the relatively small proportion of the national income spent upon educational enterprises generally.* What of the arms budget, which is taking so much from the taxpayer's income? Should not a measure of it be diverted into education?

The proposed federal aid to education does not demand that church-related colleges commit suicide or give up the cherished principles of separation of church and state. Dr. Bryant Drake suggests:

Much of the present alarm about state aid to private education is alarm lest churches which we do not like will benefit from government aid. . . . But from the government point of view, it need not be a benefit to any church, but rather to students needing an education, and a community in need of educational services. . . . It is fully as much of a denial of the principle of separation of church and state to discriminate against a church college as to discriminate in favor of it. . . . When the state can serve its citizens through a church-related college better than through another institution, the state should claim and be granted that privilege, but with full guarantee that the state will not seek to control religious thought or expression.

It is readily observed that the opponents of federal aid to higher education fear centralization and the control it brings, but that actually they are pessimistic about the possibilities of finding any way out except federal aid. Those in favor of fed-

*See Harris, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

eral aid may not be universally enthusiastic about it, but they feel that sufficient controls can be established to safeguard academic and religious freedom. Dr. Seymour Harris of Harvard sees the way out in increased federal and state aid, greater reliance on current gifts and less on endowment, and a national campaign to induce the public as private citizens to pay a larger part of excess income for education.

Considerations in Financing Colleges—With or Without Federal Aid

The Protestant reader will decide for himself how the Christian college can be supported—preferably not by consulting his immediate economic advantages. Whatever his decision, he probably will consider the following points. Increasing vigilance must be practiced if the government is to invade further the area of higher education. Religious and academic freedom are basic both to our country and our faith. Fruitful tensions between Christian viewpoints and national policy must be retained. There must be increased devotion and faith shown in concrete gifts to colleges which are honestly attempting to work out the implications of Christian faith for higher education. As Protestants, we must rethink our position on the separation of church and state, yet maintain the close relation between religion and our political, educational, and economic life. In the last place, for those who decry federal aid, why not more interdenominational planning and fund raising for our Christian colleges? Can we justify on economic or Christian grounds three or four competing denominational colleges in a radius of two hundred miles, each appealing for funds? Without top-level control by denominations, exploratory work could be done, and the securing of private funds be investigated and even promoted for the Christian colleges.

The Hope For the Realization of the Christian College

The Christian college is not a dream or an ideal; it is a

possibility, a need, and a partially realized fact. It is the supreme instrument by which secularism, with its superficial values, its corruption of man by racial, economic, and political ideologies, can be turned back. The hope for the realization of the Christian college lies in the spiritual dissatisfaction of youth, its continuing interest in securing a faith which will be intellectually true and emotionally satisfying, and the consecration of Christian folk who will dare to challenge the assumptions of a materialistic culture as they have been transmitted by higher education.

Bibliography

Bell, Bernard I., *Crisis in Education*. New York, Whittlesey House, 1949.

Coleman, A. J., *The Task of the Christian in the University*. New York, Association Press, 1947.

"College Reading and Religion," New Haven, The Edward W. Hazen Foundation, Yale University Press, 1948.

Cuninggim, Merrimon, *The College Seeks Religion*. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1947.

Harris, Seymour A., *How Shall We Pay for Education?* New York, Harper and Brothers, 1948.

Holbrook, Clyde A., "Secularism in the College," *Religion in Life*, Winter number, 1947-48.

Kelley, Janet A., *College Life and the Mores*, New York, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1949.

Latourette, Kenneth S., "The Christian College and University," *College and Church*, Summer, 1948.

Merriam, Thornton W., "Religious Counseling of College Students," Washington, *American Council on Education Studies*, Series VI, No. 4, Vol. VII, April, 1943.

Nash, Arnold, *The University and the Modern World*, New York, Macmillan Company, 1942.

Niebuhr, Reinhold, "The Contribution of Religion to Cultural Unity," The Hazen Pamphlets, No. 13.

Outler, Albert C., "Colleges, Faculties, and Religion." Reprint from *The Educational Record*, January, 1949.

COMMENT ON

What is a Christian College?

By a British Educator, Daniel Jenkins*

A good deal of discussion has taken place in Britain in recent years on the subject of Dr. Holbrook's article and it is interesting to observe how similar his point of view is to that which we have worked out in relation to our own situation. It does seem that a clear policy for Christians in relation to the future of the universities is beginning to emerge.

Perhaps I may be allowed to underline the importance of the issues raised by Dr. Holbrook. Important as they are in my own country, they seem to me to be even more urgently important in America. The vast educational structure which is being built up in this country is unique. Even if the aim of providing one in every nine persons with a college education is not fully realized, America will still have a far higher proportion of college graduates than any other country in the world. This means that, in the future, nearly all Americans who show promise of being fitted for positions of responsibility or leadership are likely to spend the most impressionable years of their lives in college. The nature of the education provided by the college system is, therefore, a more important matter for the future of the nation in America than it ever can be in a country where the function of the universities is differently conceived and where only a small section of the community passes through them.

It does not appear to an outsider that the power of Christian men to influence the future of higher education in America is slight. Many colleges and universities have official connections with churches and many more are of Christian origin and have friendly associations with Christian institutions. The state universities present a more complex problem but it is not one which can be said to be insoluble because

*The Reverend Mr. Jenkins, an English Congregational minister, is now in this country on a Commonwealth Fund Fellowship. He has been a member of the staff of the British Student Christian Movement and of the Christian Frontier Council, and is the author of a pamphlet called "The Place of a Faculty of Theology in a University."

no serious attempt has yet been made to solve it. The time seems ripe, therefore, for a much more systematic inquiry than has ever before been made into the future of the university and its purpose in God's sight.

Key Person: The University Teacher

Dr. Holbrook has given us many useful pointers concerning the direction which such an inquiry might take. There are two remarks which I should like to add. First, the key-person in this inquiry is not the undergraduate but the university teacher. How much is he doing to equip himself adequately for this task? It is clear that, as Dr. Holbrook implies, the universities and even the formally Christian colleges are not going to become centres of effective Christian intellectual influence again simply by adopting new techniques or even by the revamping of courses. They can only do so by the development of a new attitude towards his vocation on the part of the Christian university teacher. He must ask himself what it means to be a Christian who is a scientist or a historian and who is set down in the peculiar kind of community which is a university, and how he can best fulfill his responsibilities as such a person. Is it not time, at least, that Christians in the same university or in the same field of specialism in different universities began to meet together to share experiences and to keep each other up to the mark? Such consultations have taken place in Britain in recent years and I can testify to their usefulness. The Episcopalian Church has a small Guild of Scholars. Should not the same idea be taken up more widely by other churches?

What is essential is that the Christian university teacher should not succumb to the amateurism which is the blight of so much Christian action in secular society but should approach this matter with appropriate academic seriousness. One of the most encouraging signs of Christian revival in the university world today is the relative frequency with which scholars bring out books in their chosen fields of scholarship which compel the attention of all interested in the field and yet reflect a Christian way of looking at the world. More work of this kind must be done if we are to make good our title to be heard. After all, one of the chief reasons why the universities have become so secularized has been because the Church has so rarely spoken a word to them which was relevant to their condition. To speak such a word will

be impossible except from within the experience of those who have the vocation of scholars.

Giving Christian Young People Adequate Intellectual Equipment

The other remark is this. Granted that the universities, and even the Christian colleges, have become partly secularized, are we doing enough to give committed Christian young people who attend these institutions an adequate *intellectual* equipment to appraise their secularism? We have to ask today not merely, "What is a Christian college?" but also, "What is an educated Christian man?" And we must go on to ask how the education of intelligent young Christians can be supplemented so that they can become genuinely educated Christian men. It may be that some of the Christian colleges should aim, not at doing the same as other institutions, but at providing supplementary instruction for those students who are prepared to go to the extra trouble of learning enough about the Christian faith to enable them to live as thoroughly educated laymen in a secularized society.

COMMENT ON

What is a Christian College?

By an American Churchman, Bryant Drake*

Dr. Holbrook's excellent article is a contribution to the definition of a Christian college. My comment is that secularism is the cause rather than the effect of "belief in omnicompetence," "dishonest claims and practices," and "cafeteria style education." To some degree all church colleges are inoculated with the virus of secularism. The tragic picture

*Dr. Drake is Secretary of the Department of Higher Education, Division of Christian Education of the Board of Home Missions. He was formerly President of Doane College, Crete, Nebraska.

with which this article begins is the inevitable consequence of trust in secularism rather than religion. A college must be administratively and intellectually committed to high religion if its chapel, curriculum and voluntary religious activities are to have a reality commanding itself to the respect and cooperation of the student body.

Extra-Curricular Activities in Religion Important

I believe that even more emphasis should be placed on the extra-curricular activities in religion than is indicated in Dr. Holbrook's article. For instance, athletics have a prominent place in campus life not only because young men like to play football, but also because alumni and administrations believe it is important. Even compulsory purchase of athletic tickets is accepted by students in institutions which have given up compulsory chapel. If an administration and constituency of a college really believe in religion to the degree that they believe in athletics, it would follow that extra-curricular activities in religion would have a cordial reception by students.

Voluntary religious activities ought to have a larger place in our church colleges, for it is not enough to take courses in religion and to attend chapel. When religion has meaning in the lives of students they will wish to enjoy Christian fellowship, cultivate the Spirit by special services and discussion groups, and express their faith by service, and they will seek to be a part of the growing Christian student movement. Students have time and energy, and, indeed, a desire for religious activity. A recent survey at the University of Wisconsin revealed that the extra-curricular activity to which most time was given on its campus was the activity associated with the religious foundations. The church college in its intimate, friendly organization performs many of the functions of a university religious foundation, but activities in religion are rewarding in themselves and eagerly accepted when offered. Through them churchmen are trained for the church of tomorrow, and Christians learn how to function as Christians.

Financing a Christian College

All of this is tied up with financing a Christian College. Activities in religion require staff and budget as much as athletics do. Every college president and board of trustees is seriously concerned about the problem of finance. The practical problem of how to obtain the funds

to keep the college alive is responsible for many of the conditions criticized in the Holbrook article. Who is going to pay the bills?

Perhaps a businessman president can secure larger gifts than a president who is a minister or an educator. Many a prospective donor will ask: "What does your professor of economics teach?" Social action can be offensive to prospective givers, so those responsible for financing a Christian college are inclined to discourage applications of religion by students or faculty which will disturb the sensibilities of persons who can make large gifts. However, there are few cases where an administration or board is anti-religious; in fact, nearly all approve religion in a mild and safe form.

Church colleges can be financed successfully, with or without federal aid! There are more than sufficient financial resources in our church constituency to give real financial strength and stability to our denominational higher education if we become concerned. We can lift our colleges out of dependence on donors who demand "more practical courses and less impractical idealism"; who want a winning football team rather than a squad of candidates for the ministry.

Nevertheless the church college, as such, is done for unless church people decide to provide the funds for its continuance. Through our Board of Home Missions we can give help where and when most needed to save these colleges. Hard-pressed presidents will be inspired to lead their colleges toward the "realization of the Christian College" if Christians supply them with the funds. Every institution of higher learning in America is the reflection of its donors, for people give money for specific purposes in which they are interested, and the institution is obliged to conform to some extent to their desires. Therefore, the realization of a Christian college depends upon finding Christian donors.

After that, Christian administrators and Christian faculties can be free to build Christian colleges in which students will receive Christian education.

On To Action

This issue on "What is a Christian College?" left me all excited but frustrated. If only the colleges of the country would achieve half the standards Dr. Holbrook mentions our sons and daughters would start life seven leagues in advance of us! If only our church-related colleges measured up to these criteria we could support them with such enthusiasm! But what can I do? I am no college professor, president or even a large contributor. As with so many social issues I am such a "little man in a big society."

Much social in-action is due to this feeling of personal impotence. Yet the facts do not warrant it. A voter *can* make his weight felt in Washington and a reader of SOCIAL ACTION *can* make his Alma Mater more Christian. A recent correspondent put it this way, "As an individual one feels so helplessly indignant . . . but as a church member perhaps one's influence can be made effective." I would not have said "perhaps" but "of course." Through boards of Christian Education, through commissions on Church, State and Education, through the International Council of Religious Education and through the gifts and programs of local churches, individuals can bring their influence to bear upon the colleges in a most helpful manner. A personal note with every contribution, a question to the director of admissions, a resolution in the state conference meeting and a copy of this magazine to the college president may help to tip the balance. As Bonaro Overstreet says:*

*You say the little efforts that I make
will do no good: they never will prevail
to tip the hovering scale
where justice hangs in balance.*

*I don't think
I ever thought they would.
But I am prejudiced beyond debate.
in favor of my right to choose which side
shall feel the stubborn ounces of my weight.*

*Reprinted by permission of Bonaro W. Overstreet.

Ray Gibbons